

**International Association of Chiefs of Police
International Association of Fire Chiefs
National Association of State Emergency Medical Services Officials
National Sheriffs' Association**

April 28, 2017

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S.W.
Washington D.C. 20554

Re: PS Docket No. 07-114, Wireless Location Accuracy Requirements

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), the National Association of State EMS Officials (NASEMSO), and the National Sheriffs' Association together file this letter in response to the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) 4th Report and Order (April 3, 2015) and the "Roadmap for Improving E911 Location Accuracy" (November 14, 2014), filed in the E911 Location Accuracy proceeding (PS Docket No. 07-114) by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials (APCO), the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), and wireless carriers AT&T Mobility, Sprint, T-Mobile USA, and Verizon.

The IACP is the world's largest association of law enforcement leaders, representing more than 27,000 members. The IAFC represents approximately 12,000 leaders of the nation's fire and emergency service. The NASEMSO represents executive, medical, operational, regulatory, and other directors of statewide EMS systems in all 56 states and territories. The NSA represents the 3,080 sheriffs of the United States and has a total of more than 20,000 members. The NSA advocates for policies that will improve the quality of service to its constituents.

Our organizations commend the FCC for its focus on improving the location information being provided to first responders from wireless devices during 911 calls. More accurate location information allows our members to provide lifesaving assistance in the most time-effective manner. The IAFC, the IACP, and NASEMSO are members of the CTIA 911 Location Accuracy Advisory Group (Advisory Group). The National Sheriffs Association, while not a member of the Advisory Group, endorses our position in this filing. We would like to bring two issues of concern to the FCC's attention:

1. Transparency of Test Results

In our February 21 submission, the undersigned associations pointed out that a transparent process is clearly intended in the 4th Report and Order, and in the Roadmap. The wireless carriers cited the FCC 4th Report and Order (paragraphs 131 & 132) as justification that during Stage 1 testing they are not

required to make public the details of test results for technologies that have been certified by the Test Bed LLC.

The actual wording of the 4th Report and Order for paragraph 131 – Confidentiality of Test Results reads, *“To protect vendors' proprietary information, **only summary data** was made available to all other parties. Now, we will not require CMRS providers to make public the **details of test results** for technologies that have been certified by the independent test bed administrator.”*

As we pointed out, the 4th Report and Order itself doesn't prohibit disclosing “summary” results of any, including “existing” technologies; it merely states it won't require the “details” to be disclosed to protect vendor's proprietary information. As the FCC noted, summary test data was publicly disclosed during the Communications Security, Reliability, and Interoperability Council (CSRIC) III test program in 2012, which our organizations found informative and very useful. We are heartened by the FCC's recent public notice on the wireless carriers' reporting obligations whereby the FCC reserved the right to disclose summary data of this nature.

In this filing, we also note that the carriers held a meeting on April 11 with the FCC on the issue of live call data requesting the FCC to modify its reporting requirements to eliminate the need to report yield (or accuracy) as part of their live call reports. We strongly agree with the FCC's position on the need to provide this data and note that the FCC itself references this yield/accuracy metric is consistent with Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) 0500031 calculations which the carriers must complete in any case to certify compliance. As the carriers note, the Order notes that the test bed results are used to determine “the degree to which that method can be counted towards the required location accuracy thresholds.” The FCC's reporting template simply requires that the resultant calculations of the ATIS 0500031 standard for the relevant market be included in the report. In our view, this all goes to the heart of the issue of transparency in the process.

The carriers indicate that they are providing data on a voluntary and confidential basis to assist the FCC in its evaluation of the 911 location accuracy solutions. We take exception to this statement and believe that the carriers have an obligation to provide data for the six monitored markets validating their compliance with the order. Whether the FCC agrees to restrict public access to some portion of this data for confidentiality reasons, the summary levels of performance by the carrier, by market, and by technology are very valid elements of public interest, most particularly to our organizations and membership who are highly dependent on the underlying accuracy that is being provided in emergency situations. As we stated in our February 21 filing, the carriers appear to be using confidentiality as a shield from providing an open and transparent process. The public at large, and our collective organizations most specifically, need to have visibility into the technology testing processes (including independent indoor location testing through the test beds and carrier-conducted outdoor testing), as well as ongoing live call accuracy performance in the six monitored markets. To cloak all test data from the public through a veil of confidentiality provisions, and to disclose only the carriers' certifications that they are “in compliance” is antithetical to the very concept of a transparent and open process.

The undersigned would also appreciate some visibility into the process each wireless carrier uses to perform outdoor testing, since the outdoor results (which have not been standardized by ATIS) will

be blended with the indoor test bed results (which have been standardized by ATIS- 0500031) to show how each of the carriers 911 accuracy is performing.

2. On-going concern about the Interpretation of the Definition of “Dispatchable Location”

The undersigned organizations have an on-going concern about the issue of dispatchable location (DL). The ATIS standard on location accuracy improvements for emergency calls has two levels of DL. DL Level 1 is information provided to the Public Safety Answering Point which will provide location information if the location is nearby and/or is either one floor above or below from where the individual is in a multi-level structure. Also, the ATIS standard would allow an adjacent building or one across the street to qualify as DL Level 1. The ATIS standard describes a use case where the building from where the individual calling has no Wi-Fi access points. If an adjacent building has registered Wi-Fi points, the National Emergency Address Database sends the emergency responders to that building and describes this as the DL. As we previously pointed out, we strenuously disagree with this scenario being consistent with the FCC's definition of DL.

The standard also describes a DL Level 2, which is closer to the definition in the 4th Report and Order. DL Level 2 is the information provided which finds the individual on the same floor and the suite (in other words, “the right door to kick in”). DL Level 2 follows the definition of DL in the Roadmap and the FCC's 4th Report and Order. The ATIS standards were developed without the input or agreement of the CTIA location accuracy advisory group. We raised our concerns with the standard at the September meeting and in subsequent discussions with CTIA, the wireless carriers, and APCO/NENA.

The use of DL Level 1 creates confusion and a misperception with the FCC definition of DL. We believe that DL should provide information which tells the emergency responders where the caller is in a building. To use the term DL to describe a situation where an access point is located, and not necessarily where the person is located, waters down the definition of DL in the Roadmap and the 4th Rule and Order. We cannot agree or support the description of DL Level 1 information as DL. Fire chiefs, police chiefs, sheriffs, and EMS officials will not accept a DL Level 1 as being the “gold standard.”

To date, our suggestions to call DL Level 1 another term such as vicinity location have fallen on deaf ears. The carriers have ignored our position and are proceeding along using a DL Level 1 and DL Level 2. The undersigned organizations do not agree and take exception. In the Order, the carriers must meet certain percentages of wireless emergency calls that contain location information within 50M or provide DL (consistent with the definition of DL contained in the Order). The carriers must demonstrate within 2 years, 40 percent of all wireless calls; within 3 years, 50 percent of all calls; within 5 years, 70 percent of all calls; and within 6 years, 80 percent of all calls. Only calls with location information identified as DL Level 2 should count toward compliance with the carriers' obligations, since DL Level 2 is the only level of accuracy consistent with the definition of DL in the Order. To allow DL Level 1 to count toward compliance percentages is inconsistent with the definition of DL in the Order and would remove every incentive for the carriers to improve performance and identify the location of the caller (DL-2) versus the location of the access point (DL-1). Test bed processes for DL accuracy testing should reflect this reality and match requirements of DL in the Order.

Thank you for attention to these important issues.

Respectfully,

Vincent Talucci
Executive Director and CEO
International Association of Chiefs of Police
44 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314

Director R. Keith Wages
President
National Association of State EMS Officials
201 Park Washington Court
Falls Church, VA 22046-4527

Contact: Jim Goldstein
Government Relations Manager
International Association of Fire Chiefs
703-537-4828, jgoldstein@iafc.org

Mark W. Light, CAE
Chief Executive Officer and Executive Director
International Association of Fire Chiefs
4025 Fair Ridge Drive, Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22033-2868

Johnathan F. Thompson
Executive Director
National Sheriffs' Association
1450 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22324-3490